

1999

## Bound to Serve: Indentured Servitude in Colonial Virginia, 1624-1776

Penny Howard  
*Georgia College & State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://kb.gcsu.edu/thecorinthian>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Howard, Penny (1999) "Bound to Serve: Indentured Servitude in Colonial Virginia, 1624-1776," *The Corinthian*: Vol. 1 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://kb.gcsu.edu/thecorinthian/vol1/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research at Knowledge Box. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Corinthian by an authorized editor of Knowledge Box.

# Bound to Serve: Indentured Servitude in Colonial Virginia, 1624-1776

Penny Howard

*Faculty Sponsor: Martha Keber*

At length, when, after a long and tedious voyage, the ships come in sight of land, so that the promontories can be seen, which the people were so eager and anxious to see, all creep from below on deck to see the land from afar, and they weep for joy, and pray and sing, thanking and praising God. This sight of the land makes the people on board the ship, especially the sick and the half dead, alive again, so that their hearts leap within them; they shout and rejoice, and are content to bear their misery in patience, in the hope that they may soon reach the land in safety. But alas!<sup>1</sup>

They were of all ages, male, female, adult and child. They traversed the Atlantic in ships such as the *Mary Gould*, *Southampton*, *Abbigall*, and *George*:

Robert Browne aged 25 in the *Mary Gould* 1618.

Rebeca Browne aged 24 in the *Southampton* 1623.

Elizabeth Pope aged 8 in the *Abbigall* 1621.

Niccolas Granger age 15 in the *George* 1622.<sup>2</sup>

They had one thing in common: all were servants. All chanced a harrowing journey anywhere from five weeks to several months across the temperamental Atlantic armed only with a hope for a better future. But alas!

Conditions on the English merchantman bordered on the inhumane. Privacy disappeared; the human cargo fought for space,

competing against the common infestation of rats; sickness fueled by fetid water and rancid food ravaged the passengers; the combined odors of human waste, smoke, and bilge water formed a putrid concoction that assailed the senses of all on board.<sup>3</sup>

“That most people get sick is not surprising,” wrote indentured servant Gottlieb Mittelberger in 1750. “Warm food is served only three times a week . . . such meals can hardly be eaten on account of being so unclean. The water which is served on the ships is often very black, thick and full of worms . . . the biscuit is filled with red worms and spiders nests.”<sup>4</sup> Worm-filled water and spider-infested biscuits seemed vile enough, yet conditions could and did get worse for some traveling to the New World. Consider the fate of the *Virginia Merchant*. In 1649 the *Virginia Merchant*, filled with 350 men, women, and children, battled a two-front war: the elements and famine. The ship lost its mainmast in a storm off the coast of Cape Hatteras and fought tempests for eleven days. Food ran low, and men and women bartered over the many rats that infested the ship’s hull. The captain put the weakest ashore on an uninhabited island. As death took its toll upon the sick, “the living fed upon the dead.”<sup>5</sup> Danger from inhumane conditions and danger from the sea made for a horrendous and potentially life-threatening voyage. Thus were the immigrants initiated to the realities of a new life. The voyage was a foretaste of what was to come.

With the challenge of the sea met, another challenge awaited the indentured: to become ultimately free men and women. Before slavery became the prevalent form of labor in the South, indentured labor performed the arduous and dangerous task of traveling in tobacco fields.<sup>6</sup> Some historians have deemed this labor “white slavery.” The status of indentured servitude in Southern society has been debated for decades without any resolution.

Was indentured servitude the cornerstone of slavery? If such a premise is to be accepted, then the indentured may be termed “white slaves.” Yet not all historians are so quick to place the label of slave on servants who worked for a set term. Other historians argue that servitude was a form of apprenticeship and servants were treated no worse than their European counterparts. Indeed, historians rightly



contend that precedent in English common law set the precedent for Virginia statutes regarding servitude. Each theory is valid; each theory is also vitally flawed. A close examination of the laws and court records of colonial Virginia can resolve this controversy and provide a better understanding of both the legal and the social status of indentured servants. American indentured servitude was birthed in Virginia, the cradle of American liberty. It was in the Old Dominion where the majority of indentured servants entered into contract. The records of the House of Burgesses, that honored legislative body, tell a story not of the white slave, nor of the transplanted apprentice, but of the quasi-slave.

Before tackling the issue of the status of this truly unique class of immigrants, the details of indentured servitude and the identity of the indentured must be determined. What was indentured servitude? Who were the indentured? What did it mean to be indentured? Why and how did men, women, and children come to Virginia?

An indenture was a legal contract by which the servant bound him- or herself to serve a master in such employments as the master might assign for a given length of time, typically anywhere from four to seven years<sup>7</sup> and usually at a specified plantation. In return, the master transported the servant to the colony, furnished the servant with adequate food, drink, clothing, and shelter during his service, and perhaps gave him some reward at the completion of the term.

Practically all of the servants were young. The Bristol seaport departure records do not give ages, but they are given in the London group. The majority of this latter group (mainly men) were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, with twenty-one and twenty-two predominating.<sup>8</sup>

Throughout the seventeenth century, England furnished labor for the colony in agricultural Virginia. During the tobacco boom of the 1620s, the demand for servants was high.<sup>9</sup> From the early seventeenth until the beginning of the eighteenth century, indentured servitude constituted the main labor force of colonial Virginia.<sup>10</sup> During all of the seventeenth century, the only method by which a poor person could get to the colonies or by which white labor could be supplied was through indentured servitude.

A brief history of indentured servitude can illustrate exactly what being indentured meant in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Indentured servitude was by no means a Virginian invention; one must go to the mother country to find its origins. Agricultural servitude was a traditional form of dependent service in England; it was a renewable, annual contract. The master hired servants in order to increase labor potential beyond the bounds of his family. This type of service was highly suited to the early modern English economy, which was agriculture-based.<sup>11</sup> Although the precedent for contract labor was established in England, indentures to the colony evolved to better suit the New World. Whether in England or in Virginia, the indenture or contract was a vital part of the business transaction between master and servant. The indenture was a legal contract backed by law. The contractual tradition in England was conducive to the tobacco culture of Virginia. During the seventeenth century, the white servant was more significant than the slave in supplying the demand for labor. In 1683 there were twelve thousand of these quasi-slaves in Virginia, composing about one-sixth of the population.<sup>12</sup>

White indentured servants and their masters came to Virginia mainly from England. According to historian Wesley Frank Craven, the servant's place of origin was an important issue. Because of the predominance of those of English origin in Virginia, Craven suggested that their identification with the traditions of the common law was significant.<sup>13</sup> From the tradition of common law came the statutes governing the life of the indentured servant.

In exchange for their service, indentured servants received their passage paid from England, as well as food, clothing, and shelter once they arrived in the colony. With expansion of agriculture and industry, immigration from England to Virginia increased rapidly, and around 1624 servants began to sign formal indentures.<sup>14</sup> Some were paid a salary, but this situation was rare. Typically, when the contract expired, the servant was paid freedom dues of corn, tools, and clothing and was allowed to leave the plantation. Depending upon the terms of indenture and the generosity of the master, some servants received land. However, receipt of such freedom dues



occurred only rarely, and then only when specified in the indenture contract. Many indentures specified that the reward given to the indentured servant in addition to freedom was determined "according to the custom of the country."<sup>15</sup> Such "customs" left great room for interpretation. Those servants who traveled to Virginia without indentures hoping to receive a fair contract were particularly vulnerable to unscrupulous masters. The servants listed in the Bristol registers were all servants with contracts. However, many servants—perhaps up to 40 percent—arrived in the colony without contracts and served according to local custom.

Servants who emigrated without contracts tended to be younger than those with contracts, those without contracts averaging sixteen years of age. Thomas Cavenah came to Virginia without indentures: On July 25, 1697 "Thomas Cavenah, serv<sup>t</sup> to Anthony Steptoe, being brought to this Court to be adjudged is by the Court adjudged sixteen years of age and ordered he serve his said master according to Law."<sup>16</sup> In contrast, servants with contracts were usually in their late teens and early twenties. By custom, the servants without indentures served longer terms than those who arrived with indentures.<sup>17</sup> Servants who traveled with or without indentures were named "voluntary servants." Another form of servitude existed: "involuntary servitude." Involuntary servitude involved the forced transportation of convicts, whose terms often stretched twice the length of those ordinary servants.<sup>18</sup> The term "convict" was deceptive. "Convicts" included not only common felons, but also any person unlucky enough to commit one of a multitude of often trivial infractions. Such "convicts" could be and were judged worthy of deportation. The category of "convict" included political dissenters as well as Scottish and Irish military prisoners captured in battle with the English. They, too, ended up as the involuntarily indentured.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, a new form of indentured servant appeared: the redemptioner. Redemptioners were sometimes individuals, but usually they traveled as families who sought to "redeem" the cost of their transportation to the New World by having friends or relatives fund the portion of the voyage they were unable to pay. They came as immigrants hoping to transplant

themselves in a new home in America. When unable to pay for their passage,<sup>19</sup> redemptioners were sold, usually individually, to the highest bidder as indentured servants.<sup>20</sup> The potentially unpleasant realities of such transactions were recorded by indentured servant John Harrower on "Munday 16 May 1774":

This day severalls came on board to purchase servts. Indentures and among them there was two Soul drivers. They are men who make it their bussines to go on board all ships who have in either Servants or Convicts and buy sometimes the whole and sometimes a parcell of them as they can agree, and then they drive them through the Country like a parcell of Sheep untill they can sell them to advantage, but all went away without buying any.<sup>21</sup>

The implication of the passage was clear. Servants and convicts (note there was no distinction) were driven through the country "like a parcell of Sheep." Men were traded like animals. Other involuntary servants were those who were forced or kidnapped. Convicts formed a minority of the indentured as did men, women, and children who were kidnapped or "spirited away." This paper will primarily deal with those indentured by choice or necessity, and will not go into great detail about the smaller number of individuals forced into indenture contracts.

Whether indentured or redemptioner,<sup>22</sup> the type of individuals who constituted this main labor force has been a source of debate among historians. One theory is that colonial servants were mainly "rogues, whores, and vagabonds," recruited within schemes to reduce the vagrancy problem in England.<sup>23</sup> This theory is far too narrow. Many historians who follow the theory have latched onto the words of Sir Josiah Child who penned in 1644 that Virginia and Barbados were first peopled by

a sort of loose vagrant people, vicious and destitute of means to live at home (being either unfit for labour, or as such as could find none to employ themselves about, or has so misbehaved themselves by whoring, thieving or other debauchery. . . . <sup>24</sup>



There was some truth in Sir Josiah's denunciation of the indentured. It was next to impossible for the poor in England to find work; some servants were, indeed, convicts, and some were spirited away from the streets of London.<sup>25</sup> However, Sir Josiah's comments about servants should be attributed to his position in society. Men from the upper echelons of society reflect the prejudices of the time, and their attitudes judged the subordinate to be morally unequal. Historian Robert J. Steinfeld wrote that "the employment relationship was not conceived as the simple product of a voluntary agreement between juridical equals. Master-servant law prescribed a separate legal status for those who worked for others. It placed masters over their workers in a truncated legal hierarchy of ranks and orders."<sup>26</sup> With this understanding, one can doubt Sir Josiah's declaration that servants were "a loose vagrant people, vicious and destitute of means to live at home."

Historians who contend that colonial servants were dredged from the bottom rung of society are wrong. Seventeenth-century colonial servants were not all drawn from England's "riff-raff," but from a wider spectrum of society, in fairly equal numbers from the ranks of farmers, artisans, unskilled wage laborers, and domestic servants.

Even if servants were not drawn from England's "riff-raff," the term "indentured servant" carried with it a negative connotation and status which not even the skilled could escape. The status of the servant is apparent in two types of laws concerning the indentured servant: contractual and regulatory. Contractual laws were concerned with aspects of the terms of indenture; regulatory laws pertained to the regulation of the behavior of the indentured servant. An examination of the statutes and court records concerning indentured servants can establish the servants' place in society. Contractual laws and regulatory laws were created for indentured servants as a separate class of people. They were a people who were viewed differently from free men. During the term of indenture, the servant was not seen as a free man who happened to be a servant for a specified time; he was, as evidenced in the laws and court records of colonial Virginia, seen as something closer to a quasi-slave than a free man.<sup>27</sup>



It is doubtful that those entering an indenture understood how servants were viewed in Virginia, or even had an understanding of the potential hardships of their service. The motivation for the multitude of people entering indentured service was both the understood and imagined benefits from such service. There was confusion about the headright system. Some servants believed that like the master, they would receive land. British official J. W. Greenwood's "Instructions to Lord Culpeper [Governor of Virginia]" of the 1681 Virginia Statutes included a law that tended to confirm that belief. The law read:

Our will and Pleasure is that all servants that shall come to our said Colonie of Virginia shall serve their respective Masters for the term prescribed by the Laws of that Colonie. And of the said term have 50 acres of land set out and assigned to every of their Heirs and Assigns—forever and the Rent and Duties usually paid and reserved.<sup>28</sup>

According to the statute, not only were masters entitled to land, but their servants as well; the practice of granting land for each servant brought to Virginia was known as the headright system.<sup>29</sup> The system thrived. Immigrants unable to cover their own expense were gladly brought over to the colony at the planter's expense. The initial outlay of the cost of transportation and the cost of supplying a servant with shelter and food was negligible in comparison to the benefits of such a transaction: free labor and land. In the 1642 will of merchant and plantation owner William Tucker, Tucker stated:

I have transported divers servants thither which for every servant I am to have Fiftie acres of land, for my first Dividend, which will amount unto 3000 acres for the first dividend, 3000 for the second dividend and 3000 acres for the third.<sup>30</sup>

Although the 1681 law concerning servants clearly stated that "all" former servants could receive fifty acres of land, such was not the case. In fact, the law, though not unique,<sup>31</sup> was not enforced.<sup>32</sup>

Some contracts specified land, but most did not. Wages, room and board, and a chance to start over were enough to promote indentured servitude. However, if not land, then some sort of recompense was required at the end of service. One 1705 statute<sup>33</sup> read:

And whereas there has been a good and laudable custome of allowing servants corn and clothes for their present support upon their freedom; but nothing in that nature ever made certain. Be it also enacted that there shall be paid and allowed to every imported servant not having yearly wages, at the time of service ended, by the master or owner of such servant: To every male servant, ten bushels of indian corn, thirty shillings in money, or the value thereof, in goods, and one well-fixed musket of the value of twenty shillings, at least. And to every woman servant, fifteen bushels of indian corn, and forty shillings in money, in the value thereof, in goods [no musket].<sup>34</sup>

By making what had been only a “good and laudable custom” a right, the law insured that the servant would receive at least the bare necessities to start life as a free person. A custom, previously abused, designated the minimum freedom dues allocated by law and granted the servant some protection. This law was not altruistic in its design. Without some final payment for services, former servants were dependent upon the charity of others and, moreover, could be a potential danger to the community. From the beginning of the term of indenture to the final certificate of freedom, the contractual terms of indenture were well defined.

The Virginia legislature passed other laws governing the indentured—laws regulating behavior. These regulatory laws, more than the contractual laws, reflected the tendency to identify indentured servants as quasi-slaves. A comparison of the statutes of Virginia with the court records of indentured servants for the county of Northumberland gives evidence of regulatory laws. Marriage of the indentured was firmly regulated. Servants could not marry without the consent of the master. If servants chose to marry clandestinely,



they would suffer consequences designated by law. In order to marry, servants had to obtain a certificate stating they had the permission of the master.<sup>35</sup> Without such permission, the servant would "receive lashes not exceeding 20 on his or her bare back, well laid on."<sup>36</sup> Indentured servants represented an investment for their masters, and masters intended to protect that investment. In 1749, one couple went to court and agreed upon additional time of service in exchange for permission to marry:

William Own & Mary Harrison, Servants belonging to John Hanks, came into Court and agreed to serve theirs<sup>d</sup> Master one year upon their having Liberty to marry & if they should have any children during their Service aforesaid they are each of them to serve one year more.<sup>37</sup>

It is instructive to compare the laws created specifically for the indentured white with those for a free person clandestinely marrying a servant. A 1661 law stated: "If any person being free shall clandestinely marry with a servant, he shall pay the Master of the servant 1500 lbs of tobacco or a years service plus a year (extra) from the servant."<sup>38</sup> While it is true that free persons could be forced to serve the offended master for a period of time, the punishments were less severe than those for the indentured servant. The free person would generally be subjected to fines as noted in the following 1748 law concerning ministers who perform marriage ceremonies without a master's consent:

If any minister shall knowingly marry such [servant], without certificate from the master, or owner, of such servant, that is with his or her consent, every minister, clerk, so offending shall forfeit and pay ten thousand pounds of tobacco . . . . Every servant so married without the consent of his or her master shall serve him or her and his or her assigns—ONE WHOLE YEAR after the time of service is expired. OR pay the master or owner five pounds.<sup>39</sup>

Should children be born from a secret marriage or out of wedlock during the mother's term of indenture in Virginia, the children would be indentured to the parish until age 21 if male and until age 18 if female. A 1723 Northumberland court record stated that

Whereas Kath: Amery, servt to Jam: Allen, hat had a bastard Child named William with ye consent of ye sd Katherine ye Court doth order in . . . of ye Allen's charge in keeping & being . . . ye sd child yt he serve ye sd Allen untill he be one & twenty yeares of age. <sup>40</sup>

Laws requiring the forced servitude of a child of such a union were harsh if one considers that the average term of indenture for those entering voluntarily was four years. In addition to forced servitude for any children, the mother would serve an extra year in indenture and pay the master 1000 lbs of tobacco (half a year's work was usually equated with 500 lbs of tobacco). The father must give security to the churchwardens for the sum of 20 shillings for the care of the child.<sup>41</sup>

Fornication was also illegal.<sup>42</sup> The importance of protecting a master's investment was imperative. The statutes were upheld in court. A 1666 ruling against a Jane Dolin concerned fornication:

20 Aug 1666—Whereas Jane Dolin servt to Mr Rich: Feilding, hat committed fornication: ye Cort doth therefore order yt she shall forthwith receive twenty stripes on here bare back untill ye blood comes or pay 500 lbs tobacco to ye use if ye parish besides what ye law shall require to be paid to her Master.<sup>43</sup>

Servants were punished more harshly than the master, since the servant had a lower status. Marriage, fornication, and bastard children were just a few things governed by statute. Some other statutes and court cases concerned servants running away, striking a master, stealing, committing arson, causing scandal, and committing adultery. The punishments for indentured servants were harsh. However, the laws also regulated unfair treatment by masters.



The Earl of Orkney, Governor of Virginia, was encouraged in a letter in the name of the king, to pass a law against the abuse of servants. The letter dated April 15, 1715, read: "You shall endeavor to get a law passed for the restraining of any inhuman severitys shown by all masters or overseers [which] may be used towards the Christian servants, and their slaves."<sup>44</sup> While such sentiments regarding the plight of the powerless existed, and laws did protect some rights of the indentured, the majority of the laws and court cases were concerned with protecting the master's property. Since plantation owners who needed servants constituted the government of Virginia, the preponderance of laws weighing heavily in favor of the master is not surprising. Yet servitude was not equated with slavery, for after the term of indenture was over, the former servant bore no stigma. However, one of the most unique and fascinating occurrences in the development of the American colonies was the classification of a group of people for a period of time as quasi-slaves.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Gottlieb Mittelberger, "The Passage of Indentured Servants (1750)," in *American History Online* (No date, accessed 6 October 1998); available from [http://longman.awl.com/history/primarysource\\_2\\_9.htm](http://longman.awl.com/history/primarysource_2_9.htm); Internet.

<sup>2</sup> John Camden Hotten, ed., *The Original Lists of Persons of Quality; Emigrants; Religious Exiles: Political Rebels; Serving Men Sold for a Term of Years; Apprentices; Children Stolen; Maidens Pressed; and Others Who Went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600-1700* (New York: Empire State Book Co., 1874), 252-262 passim.

<sup>3</sup> The bilge is the curve between the side of the hull and the bottom. It is also the unpleasant liquid which collects either from rain or from seas breaking abroad inside below the curve. Taken from *The Sea Lion—Glossary of Nautical Terms*, [online] (No date, accessed 15 October 1998); available from <http://www.blumoon.net/~sealion/glossary.html>; Internet.

<sup>4</sup> Mittelberger, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Carl Bridenbaugh, *Vexed and Troubled Englishmen, 1590-1642* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 8-9.

<sup>6</sup> Work in the tobacco fields was certainly not the only labor available for those with indentures. Servants were used as house servants and tutors. See John Harrower, *The Journal of John Harrower: An Indentured Servant in the Colony of Virginia, 1773-*

1776, ed. Edward Miles Riley (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963). Many tasks awaited the indentured. However, the headright system, which gave plantation owners 50 acres of land per servant brought to the colony of Virginia, created the primary demand for servants to perform the labor-intensive work in the tobacco fields.

<sup>7</sup> Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1975), 106.

<sup>8</sup> Mildred Campbell, "Social Origins of Some Early Americans," in *Essays in American Colonial History*, ed. Paul Goodman (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), 209.

<sup>9</sup> Morgan, 108.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 308.

<sup>11</sup> Ingrid Jane Stott, "A Profile of Migration in the English Atlantic, 1640-1680" (M.A. thesis, Queens University, 1993), 10.

<sup>12</sup> Marcus Wilson Jernegan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes in Colonial America 1607-1703* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1965), 45.

<sup>13</sup> Wesley Frank Craven, *White, Red, and Black: The Seventeenth-Century Virginian* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1971), 2.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> Preston W. Haynie, *Records of Indentured Servants and of Certificates for Land, Northumberland County, Virginia, 1650-1795* (Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1996), 170.

<sup>17</sup> Russell R. Menard, *British Migration to the Chesapeake Colonies in the Seventeenth Century in Colonial Chesapeake Society*, ed. Lois Green Carr, et al. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 127.

<sup>18</sup> "On January 24, 1614/1615 the transportation of English convicts was inaugurated by James I." Abbot Emerson Smith, *Colonists in Bondage, White Servitude and Convict Labor in America, 1607-1776* (Williamsburg, VA: University of North Carolina Press, 1947), 233.

<sup>19</sup> Redemptioners, many times, were at the mercy of unscrupulous captains who added to the cost of the voyage in a variety of ways, or the voyage, due to weather conditions or otherwise took longer than expected and thus the longer the voyage the more the resources of the families were depleted.

<sup>20</sup> References to indentured servants and redemptioners are found in Smith 3-25 passim.

<sup>21</sup> John Harrower, *The Journal of John Harrower: An Indentured Servant in the Colony of Virginia, 1773-1776*, ed. Edward Miles Riley (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), 39.

<sup>22</sup> Both those who began as indentured and those who began their term of service as a redemptioner will be classified under the general title of "Indentured." The beginnings were different, yet both



classifications ended up under indentures and the connotations that went with the label.

<sup>23</sup>Irmina Wawrzyczek, "Unfree Labour in Early Modern English Culture: England and Colonial Virginia" Ph.D. diss. (University Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin, Poland, 1990), 60.

<sup>24</sup>David Souden, "'Rogues, Whores and Vagabonds'? Indentured Servant Emigration to North America and the Case of Mid-seventeenth-century Bristol" in *Migration and Society in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Clark and David Souden (New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books., 1987), 150.

<sup>25</sup>Servants came from the merchant class as well as the out-of-work poor as seen in a survey of professions of those indentured in Peter Wilson Coldham, *The Complete Book of Emigrants in Bondage 1614-1775* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1988), passim.

<sup>26</sup>Robert J. Steinfeld, *The Invention of Free Labor: The Employment Relation in English and American Law and Culture, 1350-1870* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 16.

<sup>27</sup>By using the term quasi-slave, I do not intend to suggest that indentured servitude was a form of slavery. The indentured servant existed in a separate category apart from that of the slave and that of the free man.

<sup>28</sup>William G. Standard, ed., "Virginia in 1681-82: Instructions to Lord Culpeper [from J.W. Greenwood on the Committee for Trade]," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 28, no. 1 (Jan. 1920): 45.

<sup>29</sup>Morgan, 94.

<sup>30</sup>William G. Standard, ed., "Virginia Seventeenth Century Records," *VMHB* 22, no. 3 (July 1914): 267.

<sup>31</sup>See 1715 instructions to the governor of Virginia, Earl of Orkney in William G. Standard, ed., "The Randolph Manuscript," *VMHB* 21, no. 3 (Oct. 1913): 232.

<sup>32</sup>It seems that the British government was more sympathetic to indentured servants than the House of Burgesses. The statutes were not enforced. As the ruling body of the House was made up primarily of landowners, the supposition can be made that although pressured to enact laws regarding land, they did not enforce the laws.

<sup>33</sup>There were earlier statutes addressing recompense; this later statute is used as an example because of its preciseness.

<sup>34</sup>William Hening, *The Statutes at Large, A Collection of All the Laws of Virginia*, vol. 3, (1682-1710), 451.

<sup>35</sup> Hening, *The Statutes at Large*, 1: 196.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> Haynie, 299.

<sup>38</sup> Hening, *The Statutes at Large*, 2: 114.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 6: 83-84.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 98.

<sup>41</sup> Hening, *Statutes at Large*, 1: 439. Note: The church, rather than the parents, was responsible to care for any illegal offspring of indentured servants.

<sup>42</sup> Economics was the underlying reason for such harsh laws. Fornication could lead to pregnancy and thus take away work time, robbing the master.

<sup>43</sup> Haynie, *Records of Indentured Servants*, 85.

<sup>44</sup> William G. Standard, ed., "The Randolph Manuscript," *VMHB* 21, no. 4 (Oct. 1913): 354.